REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated July 20, 2010, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. Claims 1-47 and 49-52 were previously pending in this application. Claims 6, 36 and 49 have been amended. New claims 53 and 54 have been added. As a result, claims 1-47 and 49-54 are pending for examination with claims 1, 31 and 49 being independent. No new matter has been added.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §101

The Office Action rejected 49 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as purportedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. Claim 49, as amended, recites "a computer readable storage device comprising computer readable instructions, which, when executed by a processor, carry out a video decoding method." Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 49 under 35 U.S.C. 101 is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

The Office Action rejected claims 6 and 36 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as purportedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Specifically, the Office Action states that the term "and/or" is indefinite. In response, claims 6 and 36 have been amended to delete the term "and/or." Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 6 and 36 under 35 U.S.C. §112 is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Office Action rejected claims 1-11, 14-23, 27, 31-41, 43-45, 49 and 51 under 35 U.S.C. §102 as purportedly being anticipated by Hashimoto, U.S. Patent No. 5,646,688 ("Hashimoto"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Hashimoto describes a video data processing system 10 that has a first substrate 12 and a second substrate 14. The first substrate has a system decoder 16, an input buffer 18, parser 20, dequantization unit 22, and transformation unit 24. Motion vectors are provided by parser 20 to

the motion compensation modules 26a and 26b on a second substrate. The data from transformation unit 24 is also provided to the second substrate (Abstract, FIG. 1).

By contrast, claim 1 recites a second video data processor comprising a predictor constructor, said second video data processor being arranged to receive at least a part of said second signal, process said at least a part of said second signal to provide a third signal, and output said third signal, said second and third signals comprising a decoded video image stream wherein a part of said second signal comprises a picture level parameter word which comprises coding standard information, said coding standard information defining variations in the type of data.

Hashimoto does not teach or suggest a second video data processor arranged to receive at least a part of said *second signal which comprises a picture level parameter word which comprises coding standard information*, said coding standard information defining variations in the type of data.

The Office Action relies upon Hashimoto's motion vectors from parser 22 or IDCT data from transformation unit 24 as purportedly including a "picture level parameter word with comprises coding standard information." However, Hashimoto's motion vectors and IDCT data do not include a "picture level parameter word which comprises coding standard information," as recited in claim 1. The Office Action relies upon Hashimoto's "MPEG syntax" at Col. 2, line 24. However, the cited passage of Hashimoto does not describe Hashimoto's motion vectors and IDCT data. Rather, the cited passage of Hashimoto describes the encoded video data stream that is received at the input of the decoding system 10 and system decoder 16 (see Col. 2, lines 21-28).

The Office Action also states that "it was well know[n] in the art that [the] MPEG bitstream has picture level information such as picture type (I, P, B type) and display order in the picture header and Parser 20 at Fig. 1 decode[s] this information into the second signal." (Office Action, page 4). However, the Office Action's statement appears to relate to the bitstream that is received at the input of the decoding system 10, not the motion vectors and IDCT data of Hashimoto, which are relied upon in the Office Action as being the "second signal." Hashimoto does not teach or suggest that Hashimoto's motion vectors or IDCT data include a "picture level parameter word with comprises coding standard information," as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Hashimoto. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 in view of Hashimoto is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-30 and 50-52 depend from claim 1 and patentably distinguish over Hashimoto for at least the same reasons.

Claim 31 recites a video decoding method comprising a step of outputting said second signal, wherein said step of outputting said second signal comprises the step of outputting coding standard information, the coding standard information defining variations in the type of data, and said step of processing said at least part of said second signal is dependent on the format of the video data received. As should be appreciated from the above discussion, Hashimoto does not teach or suggest that outputting the second signal comprises outputting coding standard information. Therefore, claim 31 patentably distinguishes over Hashimoto. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 31 in view of Hashimoto is respectfully requested.

Claims 32-47 depend from claim 31 and patentably distinguish over Hashimoto for at least the same reasons.

Claim 49 recites a computer readable storage device comprising computer readable instructions, which, when executed by a processor, carry out a video decoding method, wherein a step of outputting said second signal comprises the step of outputting coding standard information. As should be appreciated from the above discussion, Hashimoto does not teach or suggest that outputting the second signal comprises outputting coding standard information. Therefore, claim 49 patentably distinguishes over Hashimoto. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 49 in view of Hashimoto is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application should now be in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicants' representative at the telephone number indicated below to discuss any outstanding issues relating to the allowability of the application.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 23/2825 under Docket No. S1022.71096US00 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: October 19, 2010   Respectfully submitted,

By _____
Robert A. Jensen
Registration No.: 61,146
WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.
600 Atlantic Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2206
617.646.8000

2039453.1